

IN THE ABSTRACT:

An Abstract of the Disclosure is submitted herewith on a separate sheet.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to make reference to the PCT from which this case derives and to the U.S. application from which the PCT claims priority. From a review of the file, it has been appreciated that while the Rule 63 Declaration of record makes proper reference to the PCT application and includes the filing date of the U.S. priority application, the Serial No. of the U.S. priority case is not recited. A newly executed Declaration that cures that deficiency is being secured and will be submitted by Supplemental Amendment, together with a request that it be substituted for that previously filed.

The specification has been further amended to include an Abstract of the Disclosure. Introduction of the Abstract does not result in the addition of new matter since it is based on the Abstract appearing on the face of the PCT.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13, 18, 19, 25, 28, 30, 45 and 46 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Boczkowski et al. The rejection is traversed in view of the impending submission of the above-referenced new Declaration that makes proper reference to the U.S. priority application filed April of 1996 (which date predates the reference). Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over Riddell et al (1991). Cancellation of the claim renders the rejection moot.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(e) over Riddell et al ('642). Cancellation of the claim renders the rejection moot.

Claims 33, 24, 36, 37, 38, 41 and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 over Boczkowski et al in view of Rouse et al. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested in view of the above-referenced Declaration which makes it clear that Boczkowski et al is not citable against the present case. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 48 and 49 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Withdrawal of the rejection is submitted to be in order in view of the

NAIR et al -- Serial No.: 09/171,916

above-referenced clarifying, non-limiting amendments to the rejected claims. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 28 stands objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c).

Cancellation of the claim renders the objection moot.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "**Version With Markings To Show Changes Made.**"

This application is submitted to be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE, P.C.

By Mary J. Wilson
Mary J. Wilson
Reg. No. 32,955

MJW:tat

1100 North Glebe Road
8th Floor
Arlington, Virginia 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

48. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said RNA comprises a sequence that encodes a polypeptide which controls intracellular trafficking of a polypeptide to which it is attached [("trafficking sequence")].

49. (Amended) The method of claim [1] 48, wherein said [trafficking sequence] polypeptide that controls intracellular trafficking is KDEL (SEQ ID NO: 1); KFERQ (SEQ ID NO: 2); QREK (SEQ ID NO: 3); MAISGVPVLGFFIIAVLMSAQESWA (SEQ ID NO: 4); a pentapeptide comprising Q flanked on one side by four residues selected from the group consisting of K, R, D, E, F, I, V, and L; or a signal peptide.